

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 28 are pending in the application. Claim 7 has been amended. Claims 1-28 presently stand rejected.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cebula et al (US 2004/0153830) in view of Morales Jr et al (US 6,687,834). The Cebula et al reference relates to a software test system that compiles elements for a test in a single environment, runs the test and reports results to a user. The Morales Jr. et al reference relates to an automated software test environment for generating a job to be executed within the automated software test environment to test a software application. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The instant invention relates to automated software test execution using Multi-environment test automation (META) drivers. These test automation drivers may be used in multiple environments such as, for example, to test HTTP calls as well as relational database statements in SQL concurrently. These META drivers provide a flexible, extensible framework for test components so that a single driver can span multiple test environments, allowing a single multi-threaded test to specify and perform tasks defined as specific steps in each of a plurality of environments in a multi-threaded execution process (specification, paragraph [0026])

As amended, claims 1, 9 and 15 recite, in part, a system, method, and computer-readable medium comprising computer-readable instructions for “a Test Document that describes at least one *multi-threaded* Test that can be *concurrently* executed in at least two testing environments.” Similarly, claim 7 recites, in part, “A system for executing *multi-threaded* Tests” and “an Executor subsystem that *concurrently* executes at least one Step and generates at least one Execution Result in at least one of a plurality of testing environments.” The Cebula et al reference is silent as to these recited features. Indeed, Cebula et al. merely discloses a software test system that compiles elements for a test in a *single* environment, runs the test and reports results to a user. Nowhere does Cebula et al. teach or suggest a Test Document that describes, nor a system for executing, “*multi-threaded* Tests,” nor does Cebula et al. teach or suggest the *concurrent* execution of such tests in a plurality of testing

environments. The Cebula et al reference thus does not teach at least these elements of claims 1, 7, 9, and 15.

The Morales Jr et al reference discloses an automated software test environment system, however, this disclosure does not remedy the shortcomings of the Cebula et al reference. Morales Jr et al discloses a test automation manager that may apportion test jobs out to a plurality of computer systems, however, each of the tests so apportioned is a single threaded test within a single environment. There is no disclosure of “a Test Document that describes at least one *multi-threaded* Test that can be concurrently executed in at least two testing environments” as recited in claims 1, 9 and 15. Nor is there a disclosure of the similar feature of “an Executor subsystem that *concurrently* executes at least one Step and generates at least one Execution Result in at least one of a plurality of testing environments” in claim 7. Thus, the combination of Cebula et al and Morales Jr et al does not produce the subject matter of claims 1, 7, 9 and 15. These claims are allowable for at least this reason.

Reconsideration of the Section 103 rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 8, 10-14 and 16-28 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 7, 9 and 15. As such, the applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the combination of Cebula et al and Morales Jr et al for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claims 1, 7, 9 and 15. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2957/307010.01
Application No.: 10/814,067
Office Action Dated: 04/16/2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and early allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 7, 2008

/Steven B. Samuels/
Steven B. Samuels
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439